

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT  
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BUREAU**

68-0157 (9-06) - 3091078 - EI

**CURTIS W CONDON**  
Claimant

**APPEAL NO. 15A-UI-04533-S1-T**

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE  
DECISION**

**THE UNIVERSITY OF IOWA**  
Employer

**OC: 03/22/15**  
**Claimant: Appellant (1)**

Section 96.5-2-a – Discharge for Misconduct

**STATEMENT OF THE CASE:**

Curtis Condon (claimant) appealed a representative's April 9, 2015, decision (reference 01) that concluded he was not eligible to receive unemployment insurance benefits after his separation from employment with The University of Iowa (employer). After hearing notices were mailed to the parties' last-known addresses of record, a telephone hearing was scheduled for May 21, 2015. The claimant participated personally. The employer participated by Mary Eggenburg.

**ISSUE:**

The issue is whether the claimant was separated from employment for any disqualifying reason.

**FINDINGS OF FACT:**

The administrative law judge, having heard the testimony and considered all of the evidence in the record, finds that: The claimant was hired on April 29, 2013, as a temporary full-time custodian one. On August 18, 2013, he became a permanent employee. The claimant signed for receipt of the employer's handbook on April 29, 2013. The handbook prohibits the use of profanity. The employer did not issue the claimant any warnings during his employment.

On March 16, 2015, the claimant was working at the emergency treatment center. A lead security officer and his supervisor brought in a female who was agitated, loud, and disruptive. This bothered the claimant. The claimant said to the patient, "You need to get in the room and shut the fucking door." Later he told her to "watch her fucking mouth because kids are in the area." Lastly he said, "Security is not doing a fucking thing." The two security officers and a nurse manager heard the claimant's statements. The employer suspended the claimant on March 18, 2015, pending investigation. On March 23, 2015, the employer terminated the claimant. The claimant did not recall what he said because he was in the heat of the moment.

## REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

For the reasons that follow the administrative law judge concludes the claimant was discharged for misconduct.

Iowa Code § 96.5-2-a provides:

An individual shall be disqualified for benefits:

2. Discharge for misconduct. If the department finds that the individual has been discharged for misconduct in connection with the individual's employment:

a. The individual shall be disqualified for benefits until the individual has worked in and has been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times the individual's weekly benefit amount, provided the individual is otherwise eligible.

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.32(1)a provides:

Discharge for misconduct.

(1) Definition.

a. "Misconduct" is defined as a deliberate act or omission by a worker which constitutes a material breach of the duties and obligations arising out of such worker's contract of employment. Misconduct as the term is used in the disqualification provision as being limited to conduct evincing such willful or wanton disregard of an employer's interest as is found in deliberate violation or disregard of standards of behavior which the employer has the right to expect of employees, or in carelessness or negligence of such degree of recurrence as to manifest equal culpability, wrongful intent or evil design, or to show an intentional and substantial disregard of the employer's interests or of the employee's duties and obligations to the employer. On the other hand mere inefficiency, unsatisfactory conduct, failure in good performance as the result of inability or incapacity, inadvertencies or ordinary negligence in isolated instances, or good faith errors in judgment or discretion are not to be deemed misconduct within the meaning of the statute.

This definition has been accepted by the Iowa Supreme Court as accurately reflecting the intent of the legislature. *Huntoon v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 275 N.W.2d 445, 448 (Iowa 1979).

The employer has the burden of proof in establishing disqualifying job misconduct. Cosper v. Iowa Department of Job Service, 321 N.W.2d 6 (Iowa 1982). Repeated failure to follow an employer's instructions in the performance of duties is misconduct. Gilliam v. Atlantic Bottling Company, 453 N.W.2d 230 (Iowa App. 1990). An employer has a right to expect employees to follow instructions in the performance of the job. The claimant disregarded the employer's right by repeatedly failing to follow the employer's instructions. The claimant's disregard of the employer's interests is misconduct. As such the claimant is not eligible to receive unemployment insurance benefits.

**DECISION:**

The representative's April 9, 2015, decision (reference 01) is affirmed. The claimant is not eligible to receive unemployment insurance benefits because the claimant was discharged from work for misconduct. Benefits are withheld until the claimant has worked in and has been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times the claimant's weekly benefit amount, provided the claimant is otherwise eligible.

---

Beth A. Scheetz  
Administrative Law Judge

---

Decision Dated and Mailed

bas/pjs